

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 14 2011

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection - Strahm

Claims 18-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0133598 issued to Strahm (hereinafter "Strahm"). Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Strahm.

Claim 18 recites:

"A system comprising:

a network interface to couple with a public network to receive a first client message and first data that is encrypted according to a wireless security format and to receive a second client message and second data that is encrypted according to a wired security format, wherein the network interface comprises a first port to receive the first client message and the first data, and wherein the first port has a number selected from a group consisting of numbers 9208 through 9282;

a selection system coupled with the network interface to select a first security format conversion for the first data and to select a second security format conversion for the second data; and

a conversion system coupled with the selection system to perform the first security format conversion on the first wireless security format encrypted data and to perform the second security format conversion on the second wired security format encrypted data based on a conversion indication received from the network interface including information regarding a type of conversion to implement."

Strahm does not anticipate these limitations. For example, Strahm does not anticipate the limitation in claim 18 of "*wherein the network interface comprises a first port to receive the first client message and the first data, and wherein the first port has a number selected from a group consisting of numbers 9208 through 9282*".

These limitations are somewhat similar to limitations formerly found in dependent claim 20. The rejection of former dependent claim 20 was reversed in the Decision on Appeal in the present case mailed on 1/12/2011. The Decision on Appeal states "*as Appellants assert, the Examiner has not provided a sufficient reason why port numbers 9208 to 9282 would be inherent (App. Br. 15). The fact that Appellants may choose to use certain port numbers does not anticipate the claimed port numbers. Therefore, Strahm does not anticipate claims 20, 21, 30, 37, and 41.*"

Accordingly, claim 18 is not anticipated by Strahm and is believed to be allowable.

For similar reasons, independent claims 29, 36, 40, and 47 are not anticipated by Strahm and re believed to be allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 3/14/11

By Brent E. Vecchia
Brent E. Vecchia, Reg. No. 48,011
Tel.: (303) 740-1980 (Mountain Time)

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040